

**In the drawings:**

In FIG. 3, reference number 25b has been changed to 22b and a new reference number 25b has been added, as shown in the accompanying drawing sheets (both annotated drawing sheet and replacement drawing sheet).

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application and the indication of certain allowable subject matter of FIG. 2.

### **Present Status of Application**

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 were objected to as allegedly being of improper dependent form. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Applicants have made appropriate claim amendments herein to address and overcome these objections.

Claims 1 and 5 were tentatively rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-8 were tentatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Applicants' Admitted Prior Art.

### **Further Response to restriction requirement**

An amendment is made to claim 12, further specifying that the method steps are computer implemented. According to the Office Action, the restriction requirement should now be withdrawn.

### **Response to Objections**

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 were objected to as allegedly being of improper dependent form. Claims 1-8 are rejected. An amendment is made to claim 1, further specifying the load ports as first load ports. Amendments are made to claims 3 and 7, further specifying a second load port of the stocker body. Claims 4 and 8 are cancelled.

The first and second load ports specified in the amended claims are different. The first load port is used for enabling the articles to be transferred between the stocker body and the track subsystem. The second load port is used for enabling the articles to be transferred between the stocker body and an outside system. Embodiments of the first and second load ports are illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4.

These added features are based on the original specification and drawings, and thus no new matter is added.

**Response to rejections**

***Claim rejections—35 USC § 112***

Claims 1 and 5 were tentatively rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Amendments are made to claims 1 and 5. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's comments. However, the number of load ports is not a required limiting feature of the invention. Generally, the number of load ports can be determined by supplier of the tools. Accordingly, as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 USC §112.

**Claim rejections—35 USC §102**


Claims 1-8 were tentatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Applicants' Admitted Prior Art. Amendments are made to claims 1 and 5, wherein features disclosed in Fig. 2 are added into amended claims 1 and 5, further specifying relationship between the delivery part, the load part branches, and the load ports. This added feature is based on Fig. 2, and thus no new matter is added.

According to the Office Action, claims are allowable if amended to explicitly define the relationship between the delivery part, the load part branches, and the load ports as depicted in Fig. 2. The amended claims 1 ~ 8 include features explicitly disclosed in Fig. 2, and are allowable adhering to the Office Action.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure  
Registration No. 38,962

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500




FIG. 3